

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/680,013	Applicant(s) FURST, MICHAEL	
	Examiner Thao T. Tran	Art Unit 1711	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thao T. Tran. (3) _____.

(2) Fred Dorchak. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 02 February 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 25.

Identification of prior art discussed: Stierli and Bochow et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant will amend claim 1 to overcome the 112 rejection set forth in the Office action of 10/4/2005. Applicant also pointed out that the claims in the Copending Application 10/680,012 have been changed and Applicant will amend the claims to overcome the obvious double patenting. Applicant further pointed out the differences between the laminates of the references of Stierli and Bochow and the presently claimed invention. The proposed amendment appears to distinguish Stierli and Bochow, subject to further consideration.

Thao Tran

**THAO T. TRAN
PATENT EXAMINER**